

Appl. No. : 10/697,710  
Filed : October 30, 2003

### REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 25, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Renaud reference (U.S. Patent No. 4,671,840). The Examiner further rejected Claims 6-10 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the O'ffill reference (U.S. Patent No. 5,817,200) and the Examiner further rejected Claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Renaud in view of O'ffill. By this paper, the Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 6 in order to highlight the subject matter that the Applicant believes is patentable over the art of record. Hence, reconsideration of the above-captioned application in light of the amendments and remarks contained herein is now respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1 as being anticipated by Renaud. After carefully reviewing Renaud, the Applicant notes that Renaud fails to disclose a form that has an exterior surface that substantially conforms to the inner wall and also has a plurality of openings formed therein with an associated air cushion system that provides pressurized air to the openings in the exterior of the form such that the pressurized air engages with the sheet of pipe liner (*See*, Claim 1 as amended). Renaud does not provide air to the sheet of pipe liner itself. There is an inflatable chamber 2 that is inflated via openings, *not in the exterior surface of the form*, and the inflatable chamber engages with the liner material (*See, e.g.*, Renaud, Col 5, line 60 to Col. 6, line 3).

Thus, Renaud is not providing air through the external form, nor is Renaud providing air to the liner to reduce the friction between the sheet of pipe liner and the exterior surface of the form as defined by Claim 1. Renaud therefore does not anticipate Claim 1 as amended. Moreover, there is no motivation to modify Renaud to provide air to the liner to reduce friction as it is specifically designed to engage the liner with the outer surface of the inflatable chamber 2. Moreover, with respect to Claim 1, the Applicant notes that O'ffill also does not the concept of a pressurized air system that injects air through the exterior surface of the form such that any combination of Renaud and O'ffill still fails to teach this feature.

In the Office Action, the Examiner also rejected Claim 6 as being anticipated by O'ffill. After carefully reviewing O'ffill, the Applicant notes that O'ffill fails to disclose the form having a bulkhead positioned at one end wherein the adhesive injection system injects adhesive through

Appl. No. : 10/697,710  
Filed : October 30, 2003

openings in the bulkhead (*See*, Claim 6 as amended). Specifically, O'ffill injects adhesive along the exterior surface of the form rather than longitudinally through the bulkhead (*See*, O'ffill, Col. 18, lines 59-67). O'ffill therefore requires a more complex form structure as it has to deliver the adhesive through the form itself. By delivering the adhesive through the bulkhead, the space interior to the form can be used to air delivery systems and systems for configuring the form as discussed in the specification of the application as filed. As such, O'ffill neither discloses nor teaches Claim 6 as amended.

The Applicant notes that that the combination of the O'ffill and Renaud references also fails to teach the concept of injecting the adhesive longitudinally, in the manner claimed by the Applicant. Renaud is not injecting any adhesive between the liner and the inner wall of the pipe as Renaud contemplates a liner that is preimpregnated with adhesive (*See*, Renaud Col. 6, lines 49-51). Hence, even the combination of the Renaud and O'ffill references still fails to teach Claim 6 as amended.

Appl. No. : 10/697,710  
Filed : October 30, 2003

SUMMARY

Based upon the foregoing, the Applicant believes that Claims 1 and 6 are patentable over the art of record. The Applicant further notes that the remaining claims define additional patentable subject matter and are further allowable due to their respective dependency on Claims 1 and 6. Hence, the Applicant believes that the above-captioned application is in condition for allowance and requests the prompt allowance of the same. Should there be any impediment to the prompt allowance of the application that could be resolved by a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at the number shown below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP

Dated: 8/25/05

By: 

Michael H. Trenholm  
Registration No. 37,743  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(951) 781-9231

1889574:lw  
082405